

10/673,805

MS301930.01/MSFTP381US

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 11, 25, 28, 33 and 34 have been amended as shown at pages 5-9 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated at pages 2-4.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Title

The title of the invention is objected to as not being descriptive. The title has been amended to more clearly reflect the invention. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-11, 17, 18, 21-23, 27-30 and 32-34 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-11, 17, 18, 21-23, 27-30 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Laurenti (US No. 6,502,152). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Laurenti does not teach each and every element of the subject invention as recited in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes *each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). (emphasis added).

The subject invention relates to assignment of interrupt resources to requestors submitting multidimensional interrupt requests. Applicant's claimed invention can fulfill the requests satisfying all dimensions concurrently and according to policies that fulfill the system performance requirements. In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 34) recites *at least one request associated with an interrupt resource, the request including at least two dimensions related to an interrupt and an interrupt service component, at least one dimension including a time component.*

10/673,805

MS301930.01/MSFTP381US

Laurenti does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention. The cited art discloses a custom processor that provides for dual interrupt vector mapping. The Office Action asserts in the rejection of claim 11, from which this limitation was taken, that "priority" is analogous to a time component. However, priority is a ranking component and not a time component. Therefore, Laurenti fails to teach or suggest a time component as part of the interrupt request.

Furthermore, independent claim 28 (and similarly independent claim 33) recites *monitoring system performance and influencing interrupt assignment policy to tune system performance*. Contrary to assertions in the Office Action, Laurenti does not teach or suggest this novel feature of applicant's claimed invention. The section of cited art refers to the host processors ability to change interrupt vector without affecting the DSP processor operation. The prior art reference does not disclose monitoring system performance or tuning system performance by adjusting interrupt assignments. It merely states that changing the interrupt vector will not affect the processor operation, which is neither monitoring nor tuning system performance.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicant's representative respectfully submits that Laurenti fails to teach or suggest all limitations of applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 28, 33 and 34 (and claims 2-11, 17, 18, 21-23, 27-30 and 32 that depend there from), and thus fails to anticipate the claimed invention. This rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 12-16, 19, 20, 24-26 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12-16, 19, 20, 24-26 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurenti in view of Bonola (US No. 6,370,606). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Laurenti and Bonola, alone or in combination, do not teach each and every element of the subject invention as recited in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the

10/673,805

MS301930.01/MSFTP381US

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 12-16, 19, 20, 24-26 and 31 depend from independent claim 1 and 28. As noted *supra*, Laurenti fails to teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 28, and Bonola fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Laurenti. Bonola teaches a system for simulating hardware interrupts in a multiprocessor system. However, Bonola is silent regarding a time component as part of an interrupt request. Moreover, Bonola also fails to teach or suggest monitoring system performance and influencing interrupt assignment policy to tune system performance.

Accordingly, applicant's representative respectfully submits that Laurenti and Bonola, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all limitations of applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 28, 33 and 34 (and claims 12-16, 19, 20, 24-26 and 31 that depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the claimed invention. This rejection should be withdrawn.

10/673,805

MS301930.01/MSFTP381US

CONCLUSION


The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP381US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731